

UN VERSUS US

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

IT IS TAKEN FOR GRANTED by many well-meaning organizations that all would be well in international politics if the United Nations could be strengthened. Abolish the veto in the Security Council, give this international organization power to override the will of the member nations, so the argument runs, and wars and threats of wars will disappear.

Extravagant hopes, to which Secretary of State Dulles has given some encouragement in his recent address before the American Bar Association, have been placed in the possibilities of a conference to revise the UN Charter, which may be held in 1955. The idea is that the hard facts of Soviet imperial power can be eliminated by some legalistic sleight of hand, that a United Nations majority would always be a pro-American majority.

Now it is pretty obvious, on the basis of the historical record up to the present time, that the Soviet Government gives up nothing for nothing and would be most unlikely to accept any arrangement under which it could be compelled by adverse votes to desist from any of its practices of tyranny and oppression or to disgorge any of its vast spoils of the late war. But there is another consideration, emphasized by a number of recent developments in the United Nations.

It would be a reckless and probably unsound assumption that UN decisions will necessarily coincide with the best interests of the American people. We might well bitterly regret the day when we would commit "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor" to the keeping of a heterogeneous group of nations, of which only a minority possesses similar political institutions, legal systems and conceptions of right and wrong.

Certainly some of these recent developments should serve as "Stop, Look and Listen" signals before we set our course on any sweeping expansion of UN powers, which might transform that organization into a super state or a world government.

LAST YEAR, HONESTY got just one vote, that of the United States, when a UN agency passed a resolution recognizing the right of "underprivileged" nations to expropriate foreign property without a corresponding obligation to provide due compensations. How would Americans feel if a "strengthened" UN should pass binding resolutions of

an international "share the wealth" character, not only sanctioning confiscation but making it obligatory for the United States to give large annual handouts to poorer countries — which would mean almost all the other countries of the world? Our fortunes would scarcely prosper under such a system.

Nor have our lives and "sacred honor" fared well under the UN conduct of the war in Korea. Politically and militarily the UN, far from being an asset, was an albatross around our necks, especially after the intervention of Communist China in November, 1950. Instead of treating this intervention as a breach of international peace and as a challenge which had to be met firmly and resolutely, the UN temporized and appeased.

Its council halls resounded to the defeatist oratory of the Indian delegate, Sir Benegal Rau, whose "subtle" method of "checking aggression" was to give the aggressor everything he wanted. It was a tooth-pulling operation to induce the United Nations to pass a resolution characterizing China as an aggressor, although the only other tenable assumption, after the Chinese had attacked what was theoretically a UN army in Korea, was that the United Nations was itself the aggressor.

And it proved quite impossible to obtain the cooperation of the UN member states in effective sanctions, such as the blockade of the China coast or even a strict boycott of trade with China. In this connection, interesting confirmation of the truth of the allegations of the Senate investigating committee, headed by Senator McCarthy, about the extent of British trade with the enemy during the Korean hostilities, comes from a British publication, *The Spectator*. One finds the following admission in an article published in its issue of July 31, 1953:

"When, therefore, the McCarthy Committee of Investigation comes up with charges that Britain is continuing to trade with Communist China and proceeds to give chapter and verse in terms of exact tonnages and values, it is doing no more than stating facts. There is no need for the Committee to go to inordinate expense of money and ingenuity in unearthing the facts which it then 'reveals' to an outraged and appalled American public; those facts could be handed to them by the Board of Trade and the Foreign Office in London. There is no dispute about them; but what appears heinous in American eyes often lies well within the normal course of openly acknowledged British commercial transactions."

American lives were the expendable pawns of the UN pressure which played an important part in blocking such effective applications of American superior air and naval power as the bombing of enemy bases in Manchuria, the destruction of the bridges across the Yalu River, the use of air power against strategic targets in China Proper and the tight blockade of the China coast. By imposing on the war the character of a ground war stalemate, confined to Korea, this UN pressure insured that victory could not be won.

NOR DID AMERICAN honor escape altogether unscathed from this unhappy participation in a conflict that was a UN war and a United States and South Korean fight. Some 50,000 prisoners, about 35,000 North Koreans and 15,000 Chinese, refused to return to their Communist-ruled homelands.

Many of these men had surrendered on the assurance of humane treatment, contained in American leaflets. This fact alone, together with general considerations of elementary humanity, should have ruled out any thought of forcible repatriation or of any undue pressure for such repatriation. Honor and expediency pointed in the same direction: the unconditional release of these men, once their anti-Communist good faith had been thoroughly established. The propaganda value of 35,000 North Koreans telling their fellow-countrymen in South Korea about the realities of Communism, and of 15,000 Chinese telling the same story in the overseas Chinese communities, would have been inestimable.

But for reasons which have never been explained this obvious, simple and straightforward course was not followed. These anti-Communist prisoners were detained, along with the die-hard Communists. And finally India, which did not put a man on the Korean front, but persisted in defeatist backseat driving, came up with a "compromise" scheme for the disposition of the prisoners which was full of loopholes for undue pressure.

According to this scheme prisoners who do not wish to go home are being turned over to the custody of a commission, composed of representatives of two genuine neutrals, Switzerland and Sweden, two Soviet satellites, Poland and Czechoslovakia, and India, which, on its record during the war might be considered a pro-Communist neutral. Under the auspices of this commission, heavily stacked on the Communist side, Chinese and North Korean agitators are to have free access to the prisoners.

Even Dean Acheson, Secretary of State when the Indian plan was advanced, had some doubts as to its fairness to the anti-Communist prisoners. But under pressure from other UN members America went along with it, making only one important change: the imposition of a time limit, following which the efforts to induce the prisoners to return should cease. At first the Soviet Union and Red China rejected the proposal, holding out for forced repatriation. But they filed forced repatriation for reference when they decided to accept a truce last spring.

At the worst this scheme may involve intolerable pressure on the prisoners, threats to their families, etc. At the best it falls far short of the moral and propaganda significance which clear, unambiguous recognition of the right of the anti-Communist prisoners to political asylum would have possessed. Gallant, stubborn old Syngman Rhee

struck a blow for American honor when he succeeded in releasing the great majority of the North Korean prisoners before the signing of the armistice.

TWO STRIKING RECENT developments indicate clearly that it is most unwise to assume that the United Nations will necessarily be on our side. The first was the stubborn battle which our delegation had to fight to keep India out of the political conference following the armistice. On every count India was disqualified for participation.

The conference, by its terms of reference, was supposed to be confined to belligerent powers. India's military contribution to the war had been zero. India's political influence in the war, such as it was, had been consistently used in the direction of weakening and dividing the forces opposed to aggression and fostering the success of the aggressors. When it was a question of choosing between South Korea, which was holding two-thirds of the line of the front at the end of the war, and India as a participant in the conference, the choice should have seemed obvious. Yet the vote in the UN was 27-21 for inviting India to participate; only the necessity for a two-thirds majority prevented India from being invited. And the issue is not dead; Communist China and North Korea may play on the division in the UN ranks and make Indian participation a condition of holding the conference.

A still graver issue is posed by the decision of the Administrative Tribunal of the UN, composed of British, French, Swedish and Egyptian jurists, that eleven Americans, dismissed from UN employment because they refused "for fear of self-incrimination" to say whether they were Communists or had been engaged in espionage against the United States, were entitled to reinstatement or to large indemnities.

It is a well-established fact, brought out by a New York grand jury investigation, that the UN and its subsidiary agencies contained an abnormally high proportion of these tongue-tied witnesses, many of whom found an asylum there when the loyalty program began to make things too hot for them in other government agencies.

Here the issue UN versus US is posed in the sharpest form. It is safe to say that an overwhelming majority of the American people would answer "No" to a question whether Americans with Communist affiliations should be holding responsible posts in the United Nations. But the four foreign jurists in the Administrative Tribunal hold that Communism is no disqualification. In the light of all these warnings, Americans ought to ask why our sovereignty should be abrogated in favor of an organization which has shown itself so often alien to American ideals.

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor*

FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 37

Wednesday, September 16, 1953

Washington, D. C.

Lend Lease Harvest: Pensive and solemn-eyed attention has been given to a scene at the State Department on September 11, when Undersecretary Smith called in Soviet Ambassador Zarubin and gave him a note. The U.S., in the note, demanded the return of 670 vessels supplied to Russia during World War II.

Now, the 670 vessels are only part of an overall Lend-Lease settlement that the U.S. has been trying to conclude with Moscow for some years. The estimate of the value of all U.S. Lend-Lease aid to Russia is about \$10 billion. But the U.S. has been offering to settle for only a fraction of this total. Moscow has been haggling and the total seems to be in the neighborhood of \$800 million.

But the 670 vessels are an exception. For these, the U.S. demands not money, but return of the craft to the U.S. The Soviet Government has made some tentative offers to purchase some of these ships. But the U.S. Government remains firm in its refusal to sell, and in its demand for return of the ships. Why?

From the Navy Department come reports that Admiral Radford for some time (even before his elevation to the position of chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) has been prodding the State Department to try to get these ships back. Among the 670 there are said to be a number of tankers. It may be that the U.S. needs tankers, but it is hard to say why. It may be nearer the truth to say that the U.S. wants to deprive Russia of these tankers.

There is said to be intelligence evidence that these Lend-Lease tankers are busy conveying petroleum and lubricants from the Black Sea area (principal source of oil for Soviet Russia) to the Petsamo, Murmansk, Archangel area in northernmost Russia. For in that area, the Soviet reportedly have their landing fields, hangars and installations to service the "great-circle" bombing fleet — the craft which are designed to attack the territorial United States with atom bombs. The Black Sea petroleum and lubricants can only be transported economically to the northern destination in tankers.

That's the reason why stiff notes are being dispatched to Moscow and why solemn strategy planners contemplate with grave eyes one possible grim harvest from Lend-Lease that was originally never anticipated.

Talk of the Town: It is hard to believe, but there are some usually knowing folk in the Capital who insist that the man who will fill the Ohio seat left vacant by the death of Senator Taft will be — Mr. Robert A. Taft, Jr., son of the late Senator. Robert, Jr., is a practising lawyer in Cincinnati and the only one of the four sons to whom is attributed an inclination to mount the political hustings. But how Governor Lausche of Ohio, a Democrat, will be persuaded to appoint young Taft to fill out the unexpired term is not explained. Lausche openly expressed admiration for the elder Taft during the 1950 campaign and his influence in that election did the Democratic candidate opposing Taft no good. But, as for appointing a Republican to the Senate seat — after all, Lausche is a Democrat.

● On September 19, Secretary of Agriculture Benson will make a speech in Eau Claire, Wisconsin. There is much speculation in Washington that Benson will reverse his previous stand of "the fewer farm supports and subsidies, the better", and come out for liberal subsidies for the farmers.

There is no secret among Republican politicians that Benson has become a whipping boy amongst many groups of farmers; and it is not forgotten that an election is coming around next year.

● One topic along diplomatic row concerns the perfidy of Marshal Tito, who has been drawing on the U.S. Treasury, but is mighty surly when the U.S. wants a favor in return. His stirring up of the Trieste cauldron today is noted as a straw in the wind, following his recent gestures of friendliness for the Malenkov regime in the Soviet Union. Recently a Soviet MIG fell in Yugoslav territory and Tito's troops took custody of the craft. It was scarcely damaged, and U.S. military men — hearing of the matter — asked permission of the Yugoslav Government to let them inspect it. Tito's regime flatly refused.

● The big horse laugh greets Truman's forensics against the Eisenhower Administration for Wilson's cuts in the Air Force. Many fear that the Defense Department will reduce the air force from 143 groups to 120 groups. But Truman — it is now recalled with sarcastic amusement — froze funds voted by Congress for the creation of a 70 group air force.

Inside the Durkin Resignation: Most published accounts of the Labor Secretary's departure are all right as far as they go, but don't go far enough. They explain why Durkin was discontented with Ike's refusal to go through with the agreement to revise the Taft-Hartley law. But they fail to explain why Durkin let a month go by before finally announcing his exit from the Cabinet.

The fact is that Durkin probably found it convenient to take his leave of Government for good, personal reasons. Indeed, there was on foot a movement among Republicans to try to propel him rudely out of his post and it took about a month — following the exposure of the plan to revise Taft-Hartley — to get it under way. It is possible that Durkin had no kidney to face an all-out fight in the open.

For one thing, Durkin had been blocking the naming of a new member of the NLRB, who as a conservative would have created a conservative majority on that crucial body, with wide effects on the handling of labor disputes.

For another, one GOP Senator (angry over Durkin's attempt to get the White House to amend the Taft-Hartley law) wanted to put Durkin on the griddle for his connection with the plumber's union. The legislator argued that Durkin should have severed all connection with the union, just as Defense Secretary Charles Wilson had to sever all links with General Motors by selling all of his GM stock holdings. Durkin apparently wanted to remain not only a member but also an active participant in the union while holding a Cabinet post. Thus, the parallel with the Wilson situation. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Politics and Business: Most of the offices on Capitol Hill these days during the Congressional recess are pretty dull. But every now and then members come to town to transact some business or other, to attend a committee meeting, and to "see what's going on". Under the latter category is the topic of "politics", but this time there is a difference. For now members display more interest in business than in politics. They are tremendously impressed by the stock market drop and, while making general observations that business is good in their constituencies, they keep talking about evidences of a slump.

Thus, one member from an agricultural state picturesquely described how the farmers there were seeking every way to get Government subsidies in their distress over low prices. Another member from the Chicago metropolitan area talked of how one large auto factory suddenly closed down last week, throwing thousands out of work. These members were interested to hear that the comparatively small cuts in Government personnel in Washington had brought about a business situation worrisome to local interests. And the visitors speculated on how far and how long this would go on.

UN and US: Feeling is mounting in various parts of the United States against the United Nations organization. In California, Texas, Ohio and other states local authorities have variously shown their coolness towards propaganda outfits boosting the international organization. Now, Governor J. Bracken Lee of Utah has refused to call on Utah residents to observe United Nations Day this year. He said he had "lost confidence" in the world body. It was Governor Lee who at the recent governors' conference in Seattle offered resolutions to (1) study whether the UN Charter violates the U.S. Constitution and (2) to require UN members to furnish troops in proportion to their population.

Purge of Diplomats: It is no secret in Washington that there is much concern about how well the U.S. will handle the Korean peace talks which commence before long. In this sophisticated diplomatic center, it is recognized that the technical advisers from the State Department can make or break our

Who Do You Know: Or, should it be whom? Anyhow, you know at least one person who ought to be reading HUMAN EVENTS. Send us his name and address, so that we may contact him. A hundred names would be better. (We promise not to mention your name in writing prospects.)

position in these talks. In view of the fact (as often related in HUMAN EVENTS) that the GOP administration has effected very little change in the State Department, concern now increases.

This was brought to a focus in the past week by an "open letter" urging the purge of the pro-Communists in the State Department who helped bring about the downfall of Chiang Kai-shek's regime in China. The letter came from the American China Policy Association (of which Alfred Kohlberg is a leader), which also asked that any foreign service officers fired or exiled for anti-Communism be brought back into the Government. The letter was addressed to Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, who has won much praise for his recent negotiations with Syngman Rhee for the cease fire. Robertson, formerly with the State Department during the war, left the service himself after the war, then was brought back into the State Department last winter by the new Administration.

The China Policy Association then produced a hitherto unpublished memorandum written by Robertson in October, 1949. In this memo Robertson, after attacking the Democratic Administration policy which helped bring Nationalist China to ruin, referred to constant "reports from certain foreign service officers in the field denouncing the Kuomintang, praising the Communists. . . . All during this time certain foreign service officers were reporting the China Government to be corrupt, ineffectual and totalitarian with one such officer later going so far as to proclaim the Communist revolution 'moderate and democratic'."

The China Policy Association in its letter asked "whether the foreign service officers to whom you refer, and all those who supported their attitudes and proposals have been cleaned out of your Department. We fear that if any remain, their advice may tend to weaken the hand of Ambassador Lodge, who must rely on them for detailed Far Eastern information and analyses."

"Meantime", the letter goes on, "we understand that the anti-Communists who were forced out of the Department in 1944 and 1945 by Dean Acheson and Alger Hiss (as per sworn testimony of former Assistant Secretary Adolf Berle) or were sent to Kenya, Singapore and other far places, are still out. We urge that they be brought back to Washington to take over control from all those whose judgment or loyalty is questioned."

And More Taxes: References in the press to a possible national sales tax have the earmarks of "feelers" inspired by the Administration. The bureaucracy is contemplating with trepidation a drop in Federal revenues, resulting from the December termination of both the Excess Profits Tax and the last

Truman boost in individual income taxes. The Administration is probably afraid to ask for another extension of EPT, in view of the fight against the last extension put up by Congress; and as for continuing the special levy on individual incomes that terminates this year, that is politically inadvisable.

But what of an increase in the debt limit? The Administration's hopes in that direction were effectively snuffed out in the last days of the last session of Congress and it probably does not relish a renewal of that experience. Since the thought of further cuts in their budgets is most abhorrent to the bureaucrats, they are cudgelling their brains for new sources of revenue, and the sales-tax idea is being aired in that portion of the press favorable to the bureaucracy.

The sales tax, levied at the retail level, has one merit: it can be avoided. The consumer pays no tax on what he does not buy. When the price is high, whether due to taxes or other costs, he simply goes without. This is one argument used against a sales tax; it tends to discourage trade and might seriously affect business. But, from the standpoint of the consumer, not the government, it is the least obnoxious of taxes, in that he can oppose it personally at the sales counter.

The hint is being thrown out that a national sales tax would be a "replacement" for the taxes being dropped. This may be so at the present time; but what assurance would we have that after a sales tax is introduced, the government would not discover an "emergency" calling for the reintroduction of the discontinued taxes, in addition to the sales tax? No government has ever traded one power in favor of another — not permanently; whatever power it relinquishes in such a transaction is soon re-acquired. Thus, when the income tax was being advocated in the early part of the century, and before 1900, the excuse given was the need of revenue to replace what would be lost in a proposed reduction of tariffs. That was Cleveland's argument in 1892, and it was continued right up to the time the Sixteenth Amendment was enacted. But, as soon as this Amendment was incorporated into the Constitution, tariffs started reaching for the sky.

Freedom is in better case where taxes are low. The impending slight reduction in income taxes should not be replaced with a sales tax. The government should be forced to solve its fiscal problem by further reductions in spending.

Between Covers: *Communist Propaganda in Churches and Schools*, a pamphlet prepared and released by the American Council of Christian Churches in California (42 N. Raymond Avenue, Pasadena 1, California). A documented pamphlet designed to support of the House Committee's investigation of clergymen suspected of Communist connections or pro-Communist sympathies. Price 15 cents per copy.

As I See It — The Sellout in Korea, a pamphlet comprising three broadcasts by Frank Kirkpatrick, one of the best independent news commentators. Address: Frank Kirkpatrick, c/o WGN, Chicago 11, Illinois, or 2501 S. 43rd Street, Milwaukee 15, Wisconsin.

Rally: The Congress of Freedom, started by Arnold Kruckman of Washington, D. C., will meet in Omaha (the Hotel Paxton) on October 1, 2 and 3. Mr. Kruckman announces that General Archibald Roosevelt (son of President Theodore Roosevelt) will act as Chairman and that among the prominent figures attending will be Congressman Ralph Gwinn, Dr. E. Merrill Root of Earlham College, former Congressman John T. Wood of Idaho, Corinne Griffith and Mr. Frank Holman, leader of the fight to pass the Bricker Amendment. The objective of the gathering is described as to "spearhead the drive back to Constitutional Government". Mr. Kruckman is head of Operation America, Inc., 1120 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for \$3. Six months, \$5.50. One year, \$10. Two years, \$18. First class mail, one year, \$11.00; six months, \$6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, \$12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, \$11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.